

REMARKS

The present application was filed on January 2, 2002 with claims 1 through 33. Claims 1 through 33 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Independent Claims 1, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, and 31-33 are proposed to be amended herein and claim 9 has been cancelled, without prejudice.

This amendment is submitted pursuant to 37 CFR §1.116 and should be entered. The Amendment places all of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1 through 8 and 10 through 33. , in a form that is believed allowable, and, in any event, in a better form for appeal. It is believed that examination of the pending claims as amended, which are consistent with the previous record herein, will not place any substantial burden on the Examiner. The Examiner has indicated that claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Each independent claim has been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 9.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-14, 19-22, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner also rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 19, 20, 22, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Garudadri et al. (United States Patent Number 6,671,669), rejected claims 11-18, 23-30, and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Murveit et al. (United States Patent Number 6,766,295), rejected claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garudadri et al. in view of Baker (United States Patent Number 6,122,613), rejected claims 3, 10, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garudadri et al. in view of Murveit et al., and rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garudadri et al. in view of Chao Chang et al. (United States Patent Number 6,567,778). The Examiner also indicated that claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicants note that the Examiner referred to Murveit et al. as having United States Patent Number 6,671,669; Applicants assume the Examiner meant to refer to United States Patent Number 6,766,295.

Section 112 Rejections

Claims 1-14, 19-22, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Examiner asserts that neither FIG. 3 nor the specification suggest/indicate that each of the plurality of the speech recognizers in FIG. 3 use a speaker model corresponding to a different one of the speakers, and that the “newly added feature regarding user speaker model corresponding to a different one of said speakers is not supported by the specification.”

Applicants note that the present specification teaches that “each automatic speech recognition system 106 is loaded with a speaker model corresponding to a particular known speaker.” (Page 4, line 25-27, of the originally filed specification.) The automatic speech recognition systems 106 are utilized to perform the speech recognition in FIG. 3. Thus, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, FIG. 3 and the specification suggest/indicate that each of the plurality of the speech recognizers in FIG. 3 use a speaker model corresponding to a different one of the speakers. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the section 112 rejections be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 1, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27 and 31-33

Independent claims 1, 19, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Garudadri et al. The Examiner has indicated that claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Each independent claim has been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 9. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections of independent claims 1, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27 and 31-33.

Dependent Claims 2-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-22, 24-26, and 28-30

Dependent 2, 4, 20, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Garudadri et al., claims 12-14, 16-18, 24-26, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Murveit et al., claims 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garudadri et al. in view of Baker, claims 3, 10, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garudadri et al. in view of Murveit et al., and claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garudadri et al. in view of Chao Chang et al.

Claims 2-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-22, 24-26, and 28-30 are dependent on claims 1, 11, 15, 19, 23, and 27, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Garudadri et al., Murveit et al., Baker, and Chao Chang et al. (alone or in any combination) because of their dependency from amended independent claims 1, 11, 15,
5 19, 23, and 27 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim. The Examiner has already indicated that claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

All of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1 through 8 and 10 through 33, are
10 in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560

Date: August 11, 2005